DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 293 UD 023 148

AUTHOR Diamond, Sigmund
TITLE Historical Aspects of Bilingualism in the United States.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Center for Social Sciences.
PUB DATE [80]
NOTE 61p.; A publication of the Immigration Research Program. Type is light and may not reproduce well.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingualism; *Citizenship; *Culture Conflict; *Educational Policy; Ethnocentrism; Language Attitudes; Language Maintenance; *Language Role; *Political Socialization; Politics; Public Policy; United States History

ABSTRACT

Attitudes and policies toward bilingualism in the United States have always been affected by political considerations. Although controversy over bilingualism is political in principle, it is a particular kind of political controversy, that is, a manifestation of a new stage in the history of an even larger controversy over the meaning of citizenship. The history of doctrines of citizenship in the United States documents the conflict between citizenship--a status indicating equal and full membership in the body politic--and stratification--indicating the existence of something less than equality outside the realm of the polity. To the extent that language formally affects the process by which one may legally acquire citizenship or to the extent that an attitude toward language expresses prejudice toward the group using that language, members of the group may feel aggrieved that the equality implicit in their status as citizens is belied by the inequality of their lives. In the United States, the closeness of the relation between language and citizenship was intensified by two factors of history (1) the importance of immigration; and (2) the use of English as a major test for determining loyalty to what was seen at the particular time as American beliefs. The debate over bilingualism is, therefore, a manifestation of two larger controversies: the conflict between the equality of citizenship and the inequality of stratification, and the conflict between citizenship as full membership in the body politic and alienship as the status of those who are not or may not be admitted. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235293

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Josh DeWind
Columbia Univ.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF BILINGUALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Sigmund Diamond

Immigration Research Program

UD 023 148

Summary

Analysis of the history of language policy affecting German-speakers and Spanish-speakers in the United States and the use of English or Spanish as the language of instruction in Puerto Rico suggests, to paraphrase Clausewitz on warfare, that language policy is politics by other means. Though language policy, both as a matter of instruction in the schools and as a matter affecting the life chances of individuals and of groups outside the schools, clearly has educational consequences, it has rarely been approached as primarily a technical educational problem. The most important variables affecting attitudes and policies toward bilingualism -- on the part both of those who have favored it and those who have opposed it -- have been political: To what extent and under what circumstances has language uniformity been insisted upon because it has been seen as a mechanism for maintaining social order and assuring loyalty to a creed whose acceptance has been taken to be proof of Americanness? To what extent has bilingualism been placed on the political agenda by its supporters as a test that they have been granted the social and cultural equality that they feel should accompany the political and legal equality that they possess by virtue of their citizenship?

Controversy over bilingualism is political controversy in principle, but it is also a particular kind of political controversy. Its existence reveals a crisis over the meaning of citizenship. T.H. Marshall has discussed the conflict in modern

society between citizenship -- a status indicating equal and full membership in the body politic -- and social stratification -- indicating the existence of something less than equality outside the realm of the polity. The history of doctrines of citizenship in the United States since the colonial period documents the conflict Marshall discussed more generally. To the extent that language formally affects the process by which one may legally acquire citizenship or -- equally important -- to the extent that an attitude toward language expresses prejudice toward the group using that language, to that extent members of the group may feel aggrieved that the equality implicit in their status as citizens is belied by the inequality of their lives. In the United States, the closeness of the relation between language and citizenship was intensified by two factors of history: 1) the importance of immigration, especially of non-English-speaking groups; and 2) the use of English as a major test for determining loyalty and allegiance to whatever set of beliefs has been defined at a particular time as the creed acceptance of which constitutes proof of Americanness.

The debate over bilingualism is, therefore, a manifestation of a new stage in the history of two even larger controversies, the conflict between the equality of citizenship and the inequality of stratification and the conflict between citizenship as full membership in the body politic and alienship as the status of those who are not or may not be admitted.

I

On October 20, 1820, the first meeting of an organization called The American Academy of Language and Belles Lettres was held in New York City. Soliciting his support, the leading spirit of the new organization, William Cardell, a prosperous businessman and educator, wrote to Thomas Jefferson:

> We have some peculiar advantages in our attempt to establish national uniformity in Language....We have at present no very inveterate habits to arrest, where gross barbarisms through large districts are to be encountered....Our scattered population seem only to want, from a competent tribunal, a declaration of what is proper, to guide them in their practice.

With assurances of his "great respect," Jefferson declined the invitation to join. What led him to gentle opposition -- an awareness that language is the voice of culture -- led John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, to give enthusiastic approval:

> At present, the intermingling of classes, -- the intercommunication of well-educated persons with those whose improvement is very limited, -- the removals from one neighborhood & from one state, to another distant neighborhood, & another state, -- the intensive intercourse thus kept up between all ranks, & the different parts of our extensive empire, -- all contribute to preserve an identity of language through the United States, which can find no example in other parts of the world.
>
> As our population becomes more dense, these causes will diminish in their operation....[1]

Jefferson's and Marshall's awareness of the relation between language and culture -- an awareness that led the one to reject membership in the academy, the other to accept it -- and indeed the very enterprise of preserving the purity of the English

language came nearly half a century after a full-scale inquiry into the connection between language and its cultural and political context. As early as 1783, Antoine de Rivarol's essay, Discours sur l'universalité de la langue française, won the prize on the subject set by the Academy of Berlin -- and it was hardly the first of its kind. Political, social, economic, and historical factors, far more than qualities of the language, accounted for the preponderance of French. As Professor Charles Issawi has pointed out, shifts in the relative weight of these factors of social context account for the fluctuations in the international primacy of different languages in the two hundred years since the publication of Rivarol's prize-winning essay, but scholarly awareness of the importance of these contextual factors seems to have come earlier when language has been looked at in an international setting than when it has been looked at in a national setting. In 1767, David Hume advised Edward Gibbon, who had written a history of the Swiss Confederacy in flawless French, to write his projected work on Rome in English:

> Why do you compose in French and carry faggots into the woods, as Horace says in regard to Romans who wrote in Greek? I grant that you have a like motive to those Romans, and adopt a language much more generally diffused than your native tongue: but have you not remarked the fate of those two ancient languages in following ages?...Let the French, therefore, triumph in the present diffusion of their tongue....Our solid and increasing establishments in America, where we need less dread the inundation of Barbarians, promise a superior stability and duration to the English language.[2]

Hume's advice to Gibbon was predicated on an assessment of the rising importance of English as an international language.

Rivarol's advice, no doubt, would have been that Gibbon should write as he had intended -- in French: "One can no more succeed in boring a Frenchmen than in diverting an Englishman."[3] In both cases, the basis for the recommendation was a judgment concerning the effects of political context on language use; whatever the correctness of the particular judgments, in principle they allowed for consideration of the effect of all aspects of context on language use and maintenance, not only of some aspects of context. In November 1979, when the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies presented its findings, its attention was firmly fixed on international matters. "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security," it concluded; "Americans' incompetence in foreign languages is nothing short of scandalous and it is becoming worse."[4] Once again, as with Rivarol, political context was central to the policy prescription; and once again -- as with Rivarol -- the political context was international. For Rivarol, prestige was an important factor in determining linguistic predominance in the competition among languages in an international setting. A century and a half later, the sociologist James H. S. Bossard rediscovered the importance of Rivarol's insight for a question on the domestic scene: How does bilingualism affect personality development? For all that the question was phrased in psychological terms, Bossard was less interested in the individual than in the group: What is the social status of the non-English tongue? How are linguistic differences related to other social distinctions? His conclusion was that social status

was assigned to the individual on the basis of linguistic behavior, measured in terms of the conformity of that behavior to the socially accepted norms of expression. In the United States, as in all countries with language minorities based on immigration, how the use of the second language and its vestiges is interpreted -- both by its users and those who only hear -- is bound up with the status of the minority goups which speak those languages.[5]

The problem that attracted Bossard's attention was only one of many involved in analyzing bilingualism, but it had the merit of looking at bilingualism in a societal context and in a national context, where, it seems, the relations of language to more general considerations of social and political order came somewhat later to the scholarly agenda. Moreover, the particular problem that attracted Bossard provides a clue to Flora Lewis's perception that there is a relation between the conclusion of the President's Commission that dealt with the international consequences of language policy and domestic implications of language policy. "The problem isn't just money," she wrote; "it's attitudes":

> English is the dominant and official language of the U.S., and of course every American needs to know it. Lack of ease in using it not only condemns people to second-class citizenship [my emphasis] with all that that implies in terms of jobs, standing, access to the culture. It also weakens the sense of national identity and the sharing of values to which the country is dedicated.
>
> ...Where a second language is widely used, as Spanish is in Florida and the Southwest, the shattered feeling of community would be immensely improved if all the other pupils were required to study Spanish....

> Refusal to accept anybody else's language as worth knowing reflects...the same stubborn ignorance, as that of the fundamentalist I heard about who denounced people speaking in other tongues, saying, "If English was good enough for Jesus Christ, it's good enough for them."[6]

The preacher's simplicities were comforting for those who shared his faith. Flora Lewis's question is disturbing because it requires us to ask what faith it is that we do share. What are the more general attitudes that lie behind our language policy? By exploring the relation we may not be able to exorcise the difficulties, but we might be able to limit the danger we do both by inaction and action.

II

This report deals only with historical aspects of bilingualism in the United States and, even then, with only one or two elements of that historical context. There are at least two justifications for emphasizing the importance of the historical context, even in this limited way: the first is that it may add to our understanding of the problem if we see it not as the product of the current world, but as the most recent expression of a problem which has had varying degrees of urgency and has assumed different forms with the passage of time; the second is that historical knowledge leads us to see connections between bilingualism and other aspects of society with which it has been associated during its career. To see the problem in historical perspective is not to detract from its contemporary importance by insisting that it has long been with us; to the

contrary, it is to appreciate that importance even more fully and to permit us to see the subject in connection with other features of society to which we might be blinded if our view was too foreshortened.

Referring to Hitler's threat to twist the neck of England as he would a chicken, Winston Churchill said, "Some chicken, some neck." Similarly, one might say of the statement that this proposal is limited to historical aspects of the problem, "Some limitation."

The most immediate, almost instantaneous, consequence of placing the study of bilingualism in this country in an historical context is to enable us to see that from the moment of the planting of the very first settlements in North America forces were generated which pushed and pulled in opposite directions: Would the native languages survive or be destroyed? If they survived, would survival be the consequence of tribal isolation, tribal social cohesion, or conscious design on the part of either or both the native group and the intruding group? Would the languages imported into the New World by the colonists disappear or survive? Did survival depend on "political" factors like the outcome of the struggles between the Dutch, the English, the French, the Spanish, and the Swedes; or on "cultural" factors like the degree of religious or ethnic homogenity of the groups involved; or on more specifically "educational" factors like the deliberate introduction of the language into the school system as part of the regularly-established program of public education or as part of a privately-supported educational effort? What has

been more important in the disappearance of languages or in their survival: conscious planning to achieve the desired result or the operation of social processes whose connection with the fate of language -- its survival or disappearance -- had not always been recognized? And as to conscious planning itself, what are the advantages or disadvantages of government intervention and voluntarism? What accounts for the differences in the way in which individuals and groups respond to the importance of language as an issue: do they see it as a precondition of individual and group identity; what puts language on their agenda at all, and if it is put there, is it as a matter of political or cultural importance?

Joshua Fishman, in Language Loyalty in the United States (The Hague, 1966), provides a number of illustrative case studies of the struggles involved in the historical experience of trying to maintain a variety of languages in the United States. His discussion of "German-American language maintenance efforts," is particularly rich in its analysis of the importance of the variables we have already mentioned -- plus such others as the settlement patterns of the German-speaking communities, types of religious belief, social and political relations with non-German-speaking neighbors, the degree of importance attributed to elementary versus higher education by the German-speakers, the role of the press.

Because of the richness of the documentation, the controversies surrounding the use of the German language provide a useful introduction to this limited survey of language

controversy in the United States. a survey which takes as its point of departure the idea that education is public policy, related to economic conditions, social organization, and political administration and that educational procedures must be evaluated in the light of the social purposes which that public policy was formulated to achieve.

III

Among the earliest of the large-scale immigrant groups to the United States, and among the best organized, the Germans were not much victimized by anti-foreign hostility before the latter part of the nineteenth century.[7] Their support of the revolutionary cause during the War of Independence, their participation in public affairs, their prominence in states like Pennsylvania and Ohio gave them both a visibility and an immunity from attack that were the more remarkable when judged against the comtempt and hatred they aroused after the turn of the century. In the eighteenth century, school instruction in the German settlements of the original colonies of Pennslyvania, Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas was in German, often to the exclusion of English; and until well into the nineteenth century, in the heavily German areas of the new states of the Middle West, school laws made no mention of the language of instruction. If it was raised, as in Pennsylvania in 1837, the state legislature passed a law permitting German schools, in which all instruction was to be given in German, to be founded on an equal basis with English

schools. In Ohio, in 1840, the state legislature approved German-language instruction in elementary grades. Other local ordinances specified minimum amounts to be spent for German-language textbooks, mandated the hiring of German-speaking teachers, and required that classes be conducted in German or in German and English. The spread of Know-Nothingism, especially in New England in the mid-nineteenth century, affected Irish Catholics more than it did the Germans, but the revival of nativism after the Civil War affected language policy even in German strongholds. The use of German was discontinued in the schools of St. Louis in 1888, despite the fact that it was approved by William T. Harris, St. Louis school superintendant, one of the foremost educators of the day, who attempted to counter the argument that bilingualism was politically divisive with the argument that it was socially desirable:

> National memories and aspirations, family traditions, customs, and habits, moral and religious observances -- all these form what may be called the substance of the character of each individual, and they cannot be suddenly removed or changed without disastrously weakening the personality.[8]

Responding to the restrictions on the use of German in the public schools, the Germans greatly increased the number of Lutheran and Catholic parochial schools which were so far beyond the reach of the state and local ordinances. But that expedient, too, was attacked as threat to American institutions, and the debate sharpened in a number of states, especially Illinois and Wisconsin in 1889. Though the laws requiring instruction in elementary subjects in both parochial and public schools to be in

English were repealed in 1893, German never regained the ground it lost during the controversy. When the struggle erupted once again during the First World War, the pro-German language position was weaker than it had been earlier, and restrictive legislation increased. In 1903, only 14 states required that elementary school instruction be in English; in 1913, 17; by 1923, 34 states required English. In 1903 and 1913, a number of states permitted German as the language of elementary school instruction when it was in addition to English; in 1923, the use of German as an auxiliary language was prohibited. Supreme Court decisions left in doubt the legal status of some state laws, but there is no doubt that the climate of political opinion had a chilling effect on educational policy affecting the teaching of German and teaching in German.[9]

As German-language policy provides perhaps the most richly documented chapter in the history of language controversy in the United States, Spanish-language policy provides perhaps the most critically important, if for no other reasons than the number of people involved and their political importance that arises from the correlation between linguistic differences and other criteria of social classification. Basic to an understanding of more general attitudes affecting Spanish-language policy, especially in the Southwest, is the fact that although all Mexican citizens resident in the ceded territories after the Mexican War of 1848 could become citizens of the United States, they were, after all, conquered people, and both law and custom reflected the relationship of conqueror to conquered.

In the territory of California, where approximately half the population was of Mexican descent in 1848, linguistic equality and educational equality were the norm at the start; laws were promulgated in both Spanish and English and Spanish was the language of instruction in the schools. But, whereas immigration to the eastern part of the United States created in many quarters the demand that the "beleaguered" dominant language -- English -- be made the sole or at least favored beneficiary of language policy, immigration to California during and after the Gold Rush did not result in a demand to safeguard the position of the "beleaguered" local language. To the contrary, the laws were changed to favor one of the "immigrant" languages -- English. In the 1850s, concomitant with the Anglo-Saxonism expressed in other fields (such as statutes suspending publication of state laws in Spanish and legislation restricting certain types of immigration), the authorities ordered that English be the sole language of instruction in all schools. In 1894, the California constitution was amended to restrict the suffrage to those who could read and write English and to require official proceedings of all branches of government to be conducted and published in the English language. By that act, California made explicit what had already -- there and elsewhere -- been implicit in conflict over language policy, namely, that such conflicts are often surrogates for long-standing, still unsolved problems that are concerned fundamentally with the definition of citizenship and national identity: Who is to be accounted a full-fledged member of the body politic?

Anglo-American migration to New Mexico did not begin seriously until the late nineteenth century, with the result that the earliest laws regulating education in New Mexico contained no provisions for language. In fact, the schools were probably overwhelmingly Spanish in character. There were few Anglos in the territory; the laws, drafted in Spanish, were only later translated into English; the Annual Report for 1874 of the territorial school authorities shows that 95 percent of the students were Spanish-speaking or bilingual. Through the 1880s, school districts could make English, Spanish, or both the languages of instruction. But, beginning in the 1890s, increasing Anglo migration into New Mexico created a conflict over land-ownership and a conflict over educational policy; the former resulted in wholesale economic dispossession of the Spanish-speaking people, the latter, in cultural dispossession. In 1891, the territorial legislature required all schools in New Mexico to teach in English. In 1910, when New Mexico was admitted to statehood, Congress required all schools to be conducted in English and ability to read, write, speak, and understand English without an interpreter as a qualification for all state officers and members of the legislature. The crucial significance of education as a method of achieving a particular version and degree of social order may be seen in the fact that though Congress in 1911 withdrew the English-language qualification for state officials, it retained the requirement that English be the sole language of instruction.

In practice, however, the situation was less monolithic than

the law suggested. The State Constitution also imposed the exclusive use of English as the language of instruction, but required that teachers be trained in Spanish and English to enable them to teach Spanish-speaking students and stipulated that children of Spanish descent should never be denied admission to the public schools. The New Mexico Constitution suggests what indeed may be found in the laws and usages of other units of government as well: that if citizenship may be considered a status of full and equal membership in the polity and if alienship may be considered a status of non-membership, there are certain in-between statuses to which one may aspire or beyond which one may never aspire that depend upon one's language.

Formal educational policy -- and language policy as it relates to education -- came late to Texas. Not until after the Civil War was a public school system established; the state reimbursed parents for children admitted to any school, with the result that non-Anglo Saxon groups of Texans (Mexicans or Germans, for example) either organized their own schools and were reimbursed for sending their children to them, or simply did not send their children to school at all.

Immigration and political change created a new situation, or, more precisely, a new stage in an old situation. Heavy immigration from Mexico together with the political controversies -- sometimes erupting into armed clashes -- that arose from the Mexican revolution and dark suspicions that unrest in Mexico was being deliberately fomented by German agents during the First World War and by Bolshevik agents after the Russian Revolution

were superimposed on an already long history of racist contempt for Mexicans. The historian Arthur Mann tells us that well before the highly-articulated anti-foreign sentiment of the 1890s, based on racist principles, notions of Anglo-Saxon superiority, associated with the doctrine of America's "manifest destiny" to expand the boundary of liberty and self-government by conquering all of Canada and Mexico, had put in their appearance in the 1840s: the Anglo-Saxon genius for freedom doomed Mexican degeneracy.[10] Concomitant with demands for quotas on immigration were demands for changes in educational policy. Success on the first front might have produced the desired type of social order, but at the cost of reducing a large and increasing supply of profitable labor. Success on the second front was perhaps more difficult to achieve because it was less surgical in its treatment of social pathology, but at least it did not threaten the source of labor supply. In 1918, Texas passed its first law requiring English as the language of instruction in all public schools, except in certain border cities and counties where Spanish could be used in elementary grades. Neither full and equal citizenship in the polity nor alienship was the preferred solution, but, as a Texas school superintentdent expressed it, an in-between status:

> ...the Mexican does all the grubbing. If a man has very much sense or education either, he is not going to stick to this kind of work. So you see it is up to the white population to keep the Mexican on his knees in an onion patch or in new ground. This does not mix well with education....
>
> The Mexican himself is...not aspiring. He doesn't care to learn English -- the very thing that would lift him... [the] Mexicans care nothing about

> going to school, and practically all the white people care not whether they go.[11]

Response to changing political circumstances was not uniform, and the reality was less monolithic than either ideology based on principle or ideology based on prejudice would have suggested. Though state laws in Texas and New Mexico required instruction in English, many teachers were Mexican-Americans who taught, at least in part, in Spanish. Moreover, dependence on Mexican labor, and the requirements of the Good Neighbor policy and the successful prosecution of the War had their effect on language policy. By the early 1940s, New Mexican schools were required to teach Spanish in certain grades; in Texas, recommendations were made to improve the teaching of Latin American history and culture and the Spanish language in the schools.[12]

That, to paraphrase Clausewitz on warfare, language policy is general public policy waged by other means, may be seen in court cases originating in the Southwest which outlawed school segregation when that segregation was allegedly undertaken in response to a justifiable concern with raising the deplorably low English-language proficiency of children of Mexican ancestry, providing them with the questionable therapy of separate instruction in separate classrooms. With the decision of the courts, it would appear that the wheel had gone full circle. Where once the persistence of a separate language -- and devotion to its maintenance or inability, as in some individual cases, to slough it off -- marked its possessor as unworthy of full membership in the polity, now what was presented as the very

educational cure for that disability was a means of perpetuating it. The language stigma was a bar to full membership; so was the putative cure for the stigma. The illustration suggests that the problem may not have been in its victims, but in the social therapists.

In the two cases we have so far examined, language policies were applied to groups within the continental boundaries of the United States who arrived either by immigration, after the founding of the national government, or were absorbed in the aftermath of military conquest. In our third case, selected for the purpose of providing a strategic comparison to the first two, English-language policy after the acquisition of Puerto Rico, we shall be dealing with a people outside the continental limits of the United States whose situation as a conquered people gave them a constitutional status somewhat different from those we considered earlier. To what extent, if at all, did the somewhat anomalous political status of the Puerto Ricans affect language policy? If there were differences in language policy toward Puerto Rico that arose in consequence of the circumstances of its acquisition, we would have additional warrant for suggesting that language policy is political policy by other means and for exploring the range of variation that different political contexts create in language policies. The short answer -- for which evidence will be provided below -- seems to be that the fact that the Puerto Ricans were a conquered people did not result in the imposition of a language policy essentially different from that imposed on immigrant aliens; language policy

as it operated within the territorial limits of the United States was the same as when it was applied outside those territorial limits. One way of summarizing the situation would be to say that the precise legal position of those at whom language policy was aimed had no marked effect on the character of that policy; conquered people and immigrant aliens on their way to citizenship were treated in very much the same fashion. Another way of making the same point, but with a different evaluation, would be to say that the legal or constitutional status of the targets of language policy was of less concern to those who formulated it than the fact that those targets were defined as outside the conventional image of an American. It was not that the social context was unimportant; the question was -- what part of the social context is important? The aspect of the social context that was taken into account by the legislators and administrators who formulated that policy was the degree to which the people involved were seen to provide some threat to prevailing notions of a desirable social order and desirable social behavior. Just as acceptance of certain notions concerning property rights became the test by which the Indians, under the Dawes Act, could establish their right to be full members of the polity, so attainment of proficiency in the use of English became the test by which Puerto Ricans could pass into the ranks of members of the polity.

Within two years of the conquest, three investigations of conditions on the island concerned themselves with the problem of language. Though they made different recommendations -- the

first favored territorial government, with retention of Spanish laws; the second favored abrogation of all Spanish laws and education in English under American teachers; the third favored gradual adaptation of Spanish law to the American system -- they agreed that English, because of the desire of so many Puerto Ricans for statehood, would rather easily become the recognized language -- or co-language -- of the island. Confident that the Spanish spoken on the island was a patois that had little intellectual reason to survive and even more confident that the laws and language of mainland and island would become uniform, the earliest administrators gave relatively little attention to the issue of whether English was to be the language of instruction. So manifest was the desirability of knowing it that it was taken for granted that it would be learned; whether the primary means of acquiring it was to be in school or out, through compulsory use of English as the language of instruction or in some other way were not of much concern.

The first Commissioner of Education for Puerto Rico favored both retention of Spanish and acquisition of English. Both were to be taught beginning in the first grade; the language of instruction in primary grades was to be Spanish, in the high school, English. By 1903, many teachers of English complained that so long as English was taught as a subject, without requiring that it be the language of instruction, progress in mastering it would come slowly. By 1905, English was adopted as the language of instruction in all grades. Renewed interest in language policy in 1909 accompanied the growing debate in

Washington over what untimately should be the constitutional status of Puerto Rico -- statehood, dominion, or independence -- and, dependent on that, the constitutional status of Puerto Rican citizens. Language policy was a function of political program: nationalists opposed English as the language of instruction, those who favored closer association with the United States supported it. In 1917, the Jones Act granted citizenship to the people of Puerto Rico, but left unresolved the future status of the island. At almost the same time, a third language policy was laid down, relaxing the requirement that English be the sole language of instruction for the first four grades; both Spanish and English were used in the fifth; English alone was the language of instruction in the three upper grades and in high school.

The difficulty of establishing a coherent language policy, within a coherent educational policy, when the political context of that policy was uncertain -- would Puerto Rico be a state, a dominion or an independent country? -- became evident soon after the policy was adopted. A survey made by Teachers College of Columbia University in 1925, inquiring into the literacy achievements of both Spanish and English speakers, recommended that English not be used as the language of instruction until the seventh grade. Asking whether English was being imposed as the language of instruction or was being willingly adopted -- there was an abundance of evidence that, when the difficulties arose from deep levels of cultural despair, the children of a largely illiterate population found it difficult to learn a language they

did not speak -- the Teachers College study concluded:

> Teaching all pupils a second language in addition to the work done by schools of similar grade on the continent enormously increases the task of the school system of Puerto Rico. Other countries have undertaken a similar task; some for the accomplishment of nationalistic ends; some because of the lack of a common means of communication; others because the population already was speaking two languages. The situation in Puerto Rico is unique in that none of these pressures is operative; a speaking knowledge of English is desired by Puerto Ricans in addition to Spanish because of the social-economic advantage which it gives. The schools are teaching English not to compel unwilling people to accept a new idiom, but because Puerto Ricans wish to learn and to have their children learn to speak and read English.... Political, social and economic expediency makes it desirable that large numbers of Puerto Ricans, ultimately all of them, should be given a thorough knowledge of English. Thus, will they become in time thoroughly merged into the social structure of the great Republic, with all its social and economic advantages. But this result can and should be accomplished without decreasing their knowledge of Spanish culture or their ability to use their native language.[13]

The Teachers College study favored bilingualism for utilitarian reasons; one year after its completion, the Commissioner of Education of Puerto Rico rejected its recommendations that instruction in English be postponed for three years. That rejection was based on the political aspect of the relation between island and mainland:

> The aim of the school, besides that of preparing children for life, has been the "acquisition of English and the conservation of Spanish." This aim is fully in harmony with the social traits of the Puerto Ricans and with their political relationship with America. Whether we should begin the teaching of English in the first grade or in a higher grade and how we should teach it, has been a question of discussion and experimentation for many years. What we have now is the result of twenty-five years of devotion to the cause of education and experience in teaching Porto Rican children.[14]

In 1928, the Brookings Institution made certain recommendations for education as part of a general study of Puerto Rican social and economic conditions. Its director was Victor Clark, who, thirty years earlier as Director of Education under the military government from 1898 to 1900, summarized his position on bilingualism with the statement: "There is a bare possibility that it will be nearly as easy to educate this people out of their patois into English as it will be to educate them into the elegant tongue of Castille."[15] Now he dismissed on political grounds the Teachers College recommendation that the teaching of English be eliminated in the first three grades:

> The members of the present Survey incline to the opinion that the teaching of English in the elementary grades should be continued....An opportunity to learn English, no matter how imperfectly and inadequately, is one of the magnets that draws the children of the poorer classes to the public schools. To tens of thousands of the disinherited in Puerto Rico a knowledge of that language seems to promise, -- perhaps fallaciously -- a better economic future....Moreover, English is the chief source, practically the only source, of democratic ideas in Puerto Rico....It is also the only means which these people have of communication with and understanding of the country of which they are now a part....
>
> [It] is our conclusion that the Puerto Rican Department of Education, in refusing to follow the recommendations of the Educational Survey Commission, acted with a true instinct. In spite of the fact that the mass of the people can make little use of the very poor English they acquire in the present-day schools of the country, as a long-run matter, we believe that a discontinuance of English training in the early grades would be a step backward. It might be wise, however, to direct this instruction to the specific object of helping pupils who might eventually find employment on the mainland to qualify for work in an English-speaking country.[16]

Recognition of the relation between language policy and political policy, grudging and only dimly recognized at times, became crystal clear in the report of Professor Michael West for Education Commissioner Jose Padin in the summer of 1936. Supporting Padin's policy of using Spanish as the language of instruction in grades one through eight, English in grades nine through twelve, West concluded:

> There is in Puerto Rico a unilingual people who have a certain need of English....The extent of this need and the best method of fulfilling it has unfortunately been made a political issue. As a result, the development of a language policy has been blocked; the system of English teaching in the schools has got out of date and out of touch with the facts of the present day.
>
> There is need of a diffusion of ability to read and understand English, so that the contact may be maintained with American culture and ideas.[17]

For a technical specialist like Dr. West, it was "unfortunate" that language policy had "been made a political issue." The fact is that it always was; what was different now was not that links between language policy and political policy had just been forged, but that the political battle had reached a point at which all parties acknowledged the connection and made it part of their program. By the 1930s, Puerto Rican nationalism, in one form or another, had made it impossible any longer to regard the question of English as the language of instruction as an exclusively technical educational matter. It had not been that when language policy was predicated on the desirability of strengthening the political ties between mainland and island; it was impossible to maintain the illusion of the

separateness of language from political policy when the character of the bond between mainland and island had become the paramount political issue of the day. Was English a politically and militarily imposed language? -- in which case its priveleged position in matters of education was one of the stigmata of Puerto Rican inferiority. Or was the increasing use of English in the schools a major mechanism for weakening anti-American feeling? -- in which case, as was recommended by the chairman of the Senate Committee for Insular Affairs, it should be the language of instruction.

The controversy reached the White House, though it was not solved there, when President Roosevelt paid respects to the use of both languages -- English, because only by mastering it could the Puerto Ricans both take advantage of the economic opportunities afforded by the United States citizenship and secure a better understanding of American principles; Spanish, because only by retaining it could the Puerto Ricans enjoy their cultural heritage. Bilingualism was the solution, he concluded, but it could be achieved only if the teaching of English were imposed "and with the understanding that English is the official language of the country."[18]

Though Roosevelt himself was silent on the question of English as the language of instruction, his statement was taken as an endorsement, and a complicated formula -- involving both grades and hours of instruction -- was worked out which resulted in increased use of English as a language of instruction at all levels of the school system. By 1942, however, the situation

had largely reverted to what it had been earlier; in the summer of that year, the Commissioner of Education ordered that English be taught as a subject in grades one through six; Spanish became the sole language of instruction in the elementary grades.

Nor did this end the matter, because the political controversy was not ended. The statement of President Harry S. Truman in 1946, when he vetoed an act of the Puerto Rican legislature establishing Spanish as the language of instruction in public schools and ordering that English be made a compulsory subject, is instructive:

> I have not considered the merits of the pedagogical program which the bill would introduce into the insular public school system. I base my disapproval, instead, on the untimeliness of the measure and my feeling that the issue of Puerto Rican political status would be confused and its solution delayed by the adoption just now of a new language policy Important as the language question may be, I regard the reaching of a permanent and satisfactory solution to political status as of greater importance, and I cannot permit a measure to stand which, in my opinion, would jeopardize that solution.[19]

It would be difficult to conceive of a clearer repudiation of the notion -- whether based on the desire to deceive others or on self-deception -- that language policy for schools is entirely or even primarily a technical educational matter. It would be equally difficult to conceive of a clearer recognition of the relation of language policy to political policy. What divided Truman from the Puerto Rican proponents of the bill he vetoed was not a difference of opinion over whether context has an effect on language policy. Both saw language policy as politics by other means; the Puerto Rican legislature saw its bill as marking a

stage in the effort to achieve a solution to the problem of the political relation between island and mainland, President Truman saw it as an impediment to achieving a solution.

The historical account we have presented is incomplete. It is incomplete in the range of cases chosen for illustrative purposes, and it is incomplete in its analysis of those cases. Enough has been shown, however, to document the main point -- that controversies over educational policy can only be understood when seen as controversies over language policy which themselves can only be understood when seen as controversies over political and social policy. Not always has that relationship been so stridently expressed as it was when the Carlisle Indian School, the first off-reservation Indian boarding school, was established in 1879. Its purpose -- imposed not upon alien immigrants but upon those who had the most legitimate claim to be considered native Americans -- was to separate the Indian child from his tribe and family, strip him of his culture, restrict his training to that of craftsman, and, by a mixture of sanction and seduction, make him unwilling and unable to return to his traditions. Language was an important ingredient in this policy; compulsory English-language instruction and coerced abandonment of native languages were major instruments for achieving the goals of the authorities.[20]

But even when less baldly stated and even when accompanied by honestly held convictions that mastery of English was a sine qua non for the advancement of the group whose language practices and schooling were being affected, the relation of language

policy to political policy was there. History may or may not be, as was once stated, past politics, but the historical record gives ample warrant for asserting that, though there is an educational dimension to the adoption of English as the language of instruction in the schools -- it does have educational consequences, however much they are debated -- the decision to require it has more often been based on non-educational grounds. The historical record shows, moreover, that the political matrix in which the policy of English as the language of instruction has been framed has most often been one of discrimination against the target group. For that reason, such a specifically educational action was characteristically accompanied by other actions -- non-educational as well as educational -- of a discriminatory kind. Variations over time in the designation of the groups whose languages are to be discouraged and variations in the educational techniques used to discourage them may be seen largely as the result of changes in the degree to which those groups are felt to be politically and socially acceptable and in the degree to which it has been felt that the very insistence on language uniformity is a proper requirement for full and equal membership in the polity. Cultural pluralism was not a value that was invoked in the early debates over citizenship and naturalization, and even now the legal and political implications of the phrase, "a pluralistic society," do not command universal agreement from those who accept the term as an apt description of American culture. So, too, have changes in the beliefs and behavior of the target groups affected political policy and,

therefore, language policy. An English-only policy which might be accepted at one time because it is seen as the open sesame to individual improvement might at another time be rejected because it is seen as an act of humiliating discrimination against the group. The rejection of that policy, moreover, can take many forms -- dropping out of school (which may be a form of passive resistance), decline in civic morale (which may be a symptom of inability to perform in the imposed culture), legal action and political demands (which indicate a reasonably high degree of political consciousness and organization), violence (which may be the response of desperation). In short, if language policy is politics by other means to its proponents, so is it to its objects. The history of language policy in the United States shows the political connection to be a constant. The variables are the targets of that policy, the means used to support or resist it, and the timing of alterations in the policy.

Carved over the lintel to the entrance of the National Archives are the words, "What is Past is Prologue." Taken in conjunction with the aphorism that "History is Past Politics," they help provide both a diagnosis and a possible prognosis. If language policy is based largely on non-linguistic and non-educational considerations, then controversies about language policy are controversies about social and political policy. Such controversies do not so much end as change their form, as new conditions in the social and political context affect the consciousness of the groups involved, their sense of the importance of the issue, their choice of the appropriate means

through which to make known their views. Continuation of controversy over language policy -- whether it takes the form of new demands or new resistances -- may be seen as evidence of still-unresolved issues concerning the political and social relationships of groups which may be different in many respects -- race, language, religion, power -- but which, by virtue of their status as citizens of the body politic -- can claim the rights of full and equal membership. Does the survival of the polity demand the sacrifice of language? Does that demand mean that those who are asked to make the sacrifice are not full members of that polity? If the historical record suggests so strongly that context creates the problem, it also suggests that surcease -- if not solution -- may be found in context.[21]

IV

What more does the historical record suggest to us concerning the relation of language policy to the meaning of citizenship? What value might there be in pursuing the notion that conflicts over language policy are indicative of still unsolved -- or perhaps newly arisen -- problems over the meaning of loyalty and allegiance and their connection to citizenship?

Fishman writes in Language Loyalty in the United States: "Language maintenance is a function of intactness of group membership or group loyalty, particularly of such ideologized

expressions of group loyalty as nationalism." But he concludes that the proposition in that bald form is of dubious validity, or, more accurately, its degree of generalizability is limited. Language may or may not be a symbol crucial to group identity, and reactions to language are not always correlated with particular behaviors toward the group using that language; English-speakers in the United States, for example, have not always responded to non-English-speakers in the same way, as if language were the litmus paper test of loyalty.

The question of what constitutes Americanness is not something that was determined once and for all; it has been a concept whose meaning has changed, and so have the tests by which loyalty to whatever has been accepted as the definition of Amnericanness has been determined.

It has become a commonplace of recent American historiography that the basis of American nationality -- what constituted the sense of Americanness -- was, in contrast to the situation in Europe, ideological rather than cultural. For Crevecoeur, that which was distinctively American, the cement that held the country together, were new principles, new ideas, new opinions. It could not have been, as in Europe, a common nationality, common history, common ancestors, common religion, for these did not exist. The "instinctive patriotism" that Tocqueville found characteristic of Europe had been replaced in the United States by a "patriotism of reflection." Acceptance of certain principles, some of them profoundly un-historical, rather than of traditions which were the shared product of history,

established one's claim to be an American. Crevecoeur's principles, Tocqueville's reflections, Bryce's self-assertion, Myrdal's creed -- all emphasized that in the United States the basis of nationality was defined in civic terms; acceptance of certain political ideas was crucial.[22] If nationality derives from the acceptance of certain ideas, it follows that it can be changed, possibly even easily changed; it might even be that the acceptance of the ideas that convey nationality is more feigned than genuine. Hence the search, in certain circumstances at least, for the most sensitive and foolproof indicators of the civic creed whose acceptance is necessary to validate one's Americanness and for tests to prove one's commitment to that creed. That acceptance of an ideological creed was the basis of nationality in the United States did not, therefore, eliminate the problem of loyalty. Nor did it eliminate the controversy over the meaning of that closely related concept, citizenship. In the United States, with a large immigrant population and with a profusion of languages, how to become an American and the relation of language to the acquisition of the new status of American were important issues.

That the two issues -- how to acquire the status of citizen and the relation of language to the acquisition of that status -- became so salient and have never achieved a final solution is a consequence, in large part, of the fact that both coerciveness and desire played significant roles in their definitions and proposed solutions. The factor of coerciveness has rarely been more clearly stated than in Riverda Harding Jordan's Nationality

and School Progress: A Study in Immigration (Minneapolis, 1921); the significance of that factor of coerciveness is enhanced when we realize that the text which is cited to attest its importance was not, at least in intent, a political polemic, but the conclusion of what purported to be an objective scholarly study, a Ph.D. dissertation in education at the University of Minnesota:

> If the test for fitness for citizenship were: first, that not only the applicant but also his family, were able to speak English; second, that the applicant were able to adduce proof that he was in the habit of reading newspapers printed in English; and third, that if a church attendant, the applicant attended services celebrated in English, these would be quite definite evidences that he was really assimilated. Without such evidence, there would remain a serious doubt. Thus the movement extends far beyond the scope of the school....
>
> There is food for thought here for the leaders of these peoples seeking to become good Americans. Those men who are the acknowledged guides of the Swedish people, of the Jewish people, of the Italian people, in this country must come to recognize the handicaps under which their people are working, and must come to feel that real Americans are not Swedes, or Jews, or Yankees, or Italians, but are men and women with common aspirations, and that these ideals are to be interpreted in one language and one method of expression. In the new home...there must be that facility of intercourse which is characteristic of the home, of the true home in which father, mother and children are in harmony, each understanding the other and contributing to the common cause. The encouragement of the foreign language in the newspaper, the pulpit, or the home is directly subversive of this home spirit; and worse yet, it is definitely antagonistic to the interests of these peoples in their desire to compete with the native born of native ancestry in the struggle for maintenance...
>
> ...the real test comes when the laws of this country relating to citizenship are applied. If the prospective citizen is really in earnest in becoming naturalized, if he really desires to abjure allegiance to the country of his birth, and to cast his lot and his fortunes as well as those of his children, with the new country as the country of his

> first choice, he must be able to show this desire by objective facts. If he still clings to the language of his birth as his chosen medium, if he is not willing to adopt the language as well as the freedom of conduct and the equality of opportunity of the new home, he is not at heart ready for citizenship. If, on the other hand, he and his wife are trying, laboriously and slowly, perhaps, but surely, to use the new language in their home life and home circle, if they are reading English newspapers, if they are attending church services conducted in English, then it may fairly be assumed that they are in truth on the road to becoming Americans. In the light of the facts herein revealed [that knowledge of the English language is the most important determinant of socio-economic differences among groups] even if there were no other compelling and vital issues of Americanization resting on the decisions of our legislators in the immediate future, the need for careful revision of the naturalization laws and practice would seem to be imperative.[23]

Like faith, language is the evidence of things unseen; it attests not to the acceptance of a particular religion, but to the acceptance of a secular creed whose principles, since they are not immutable, were not infrequently a matter of dispute on the changing political agenda of the country. The relationship between education and loyalty -- or, more accurately, the formulation of an educational policy to help assure loyalty to a particular creed in which the distinction between nationality and specific political beliefs was obliterated -- was perhaps earlier recognized in some European countries than in the United States. Consider, for example, the cabinet order of May 1, 1889, of the Emperor William II of Germany on eucational policy and social policy:

> For a long time I have been considering ways and means of making the schools in their various grades more useful in combating the spread of socialistic and communistic ideas. In the first place the school

> will have to lay a foundation for a sound understanding of civil and social relationships through the cultivation of a fear of God and a love of Country.[24]

But how different was that from an American expression of 1929 on the relation between educational policy, loyalty to a creed, and citizenship as a measure of full membership in the polity characterized by that creed:

> The World War has revealed in a way that was never before realized in the United States the complexity of the problem of training for citizenship....In the educational reconstruction that will follow, it is certain that the social studies will be given a position of new and enlarged significance. To furnish the pupils of school age with a store of information that will serve for making sound judgments in regard to matters of public policy [is a major objective in the education of citizens in a democracy].[25]

The authoritarian German Kaiser and the democratic American professor certainly disagreed on the political creed which they preferred to identify with their nations, but they were both aware of the effectiveness of the educational system as an antidote to the dangers of broadening citizenship. Opening the membership rolls to new candidates for admission to the polity presented serious risks to stability and to the vision that some groups had of the kind of country they thought they were living in and wanted to maintain. Perhaps those risks could be minimized if the candidates were screened before admission and were required, like those who sought admission to a fraternity, to spend a period during which they would be exposed to the principles of the group and their commitment to those principles

could be tested, as, for example, by the requirement to substitute one language for another.

It would be too easy -- and wrong -- to overemphasize the element of coerciveness as a determinant in the process of becoming American. Particularly among immigrants, it was also a product of desire, and to satisfy that desire there was a mechanism at hand, the acquisition of the legal and political rights of citizenship. The English sociologist T. H. Marshall has investigated the historical development of the concept of citizenship and has shown that it came to represent a kind of equality in societies increasingly characterized by social stratification and other forms of differentiation: "Citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community. All who possess the status are equal with respect to the rights and duties with which the status is endowed." Citizenship, therefore, has an integrating effect; it connotes that all are equal who are fully members of a community, and it rests that membership on "loyalty to a civilization which is a common possession." That which is "common" may be, in some cases, a set of historic traditions from which some may be shut out because they do not share those traditions, or, as in other cases, a particular creed from which some may be shut out because they do not or it is felt that they do not share it. But citizens of the polity are equal sharers of the legal and political rights conveyed by their status as members of the community. In this, citizenship stands in contrast to the notion of class which, however defined, is expressive of social and

economic inequality. It was Marshall's purpose to show the historical development of the concepts of citizenship and class and their relationship to each other. In societies whose members suffered varying degrees of social and economic inequality, the acquisition of the rights of citizenship meant at least legal equality in the body politic and national equality in the body of those about whose identity as full members of the nation there could be no doubt. The extension of citizenship has modified class structure by providing political means through which social reforms have been accomplished and by abating the harshness of class conflict through fostering loyalties and values which, by being common to all the members of the society, counteract the circumscribed and therefore divisive loyalties of class or of any other category of social differentiation. Much of the history of the modern world can be written in terms of the polarities of citizenship and social stratification -- the struggle to achieve, in the face of the inequalities that lie at the basis of social stratification, the equality that is implied by citizenship as the status indicating full membership in the community.[26]

The documents of the history of immigration to the United States read like a gloss on Marshall's text, for they reveal that the immigrants, in their pursuit of the legal rights of citizenship, learned the political skills that made it possible to mitigate the harshest effects of social inequality and accepted the values that enabled them to live from day to day, often in the most degrading circumstances, in the belief that the United States was, literally, their country. Writing in 1838

from Ohio to his father in England, weaver and farmer Edward Phillips said: "The laws are excellent, within the reach of every man, and every man of 21 years of age has a vote in choosing the law givers. There is none to [sic] high that the law canot [sic] reach him, nor none so low that it will not protect. The path to science, to wealth, and to heaven is open to all....Your sons have the privilege of becoming the greatest men in the nation. In fact this is a free country." Striking Pittsburgh steel worker H.J. Thomas wrote to hs family in Wales: "Let the masters remember that the balance of power is in the hands of the sons of toil by the ballot box." It had been very different in England, as William Winterbottom wrote his brother in 1895: "We was planted and reared on what we know to be a verry [sic] small Island furnished with Lords Barons Kings and we thare [sic] dependants and Subjects we had no say in the Matter only work and Obay [sic], just animals." The meaning of citizenship as a status bestowing equality, the acquisition of that status as a result of the immigrants' own desires as well as the coerciveness of some groups in the host society, and the relation between acquiring that status -- which gave both power and respect to its occupants -- and education and language were dimly perceived by some immigrants, clearly perceived by others. "I am polish man," an anonymous immigrant wrote to the Massachusetts Commission on Immigration in 1914:

> I want be American citizen -- and took here first paper in 12 June N 625. But my friends are Polish people -- I must live with them -- I work in shoes-shop with polish people -- I stay all the time with them -- at home -- in the shop -- everywhere. I want to live with American people, but I do not know

> anybody of American. I go 4 times to teacher and must pay $2 weekly....The teacher teach me -- but when I come home -- I must speak polish and in the shop also. In this way I can live in your country many years -- like my friends -- and never speak-write good English -- and never be good American citizen. I know here many persons, they live here 10 or moore [sic] years, and they are not citizens....I don't like be like them....I want go in the city, free evening schools and learn. I'm looking for help....Perhaps you have somebody, here he could help me.

The young Polish-Jewish immigrant Mary Antin was eloquent in her expression of the importance of education and in her awareness of the importance of citizenship for the equality it denoted. During her second year in her Boston school, she learned about George Washington; she compared herself, unknown and homeless, with him, the Father of his country, and was bewildered and delighted that she did not suffer by the comparison:

> ...this George Washington, who died long before I was born, was like a king in greatness, and he and I were Fellow Citizens....It thrilled me to realize what sudden greatness had fallen on me; and at the same time it sobered me, as with a sense of responsibility. I strove to conduct myself as befitted a Fellow Citizen....
>
> What more could America give a child? Ah, much more....it dawned on me gradually what was meant by my country. The people all doing noble things, and striving for them together, defying their oppressors, giving their lives for each other -- all that it was that made my country....The Country was for all the Citizens, and I was a Citizen.[27]

The history of language policy, as an aspect of the history of education and of citizenship, may be compared in an important way to the adoption and acceptance of policies within a formal organization. Both the authorities and subordinates have their reasons -- though they may differ -- for accepting those

policies, the former, because they see them as necessary for maintaining order and discipline within the organization, the latter, because they are fearful that disobedience may lead to punishment or expulsion and hopeful that obedience may lead to promotion. Current scholarship on the history of education in the United States emphasizes, perhaps over-emphasizes, the role of the public education system -- both its content and its structure -- in minimizing social conflicts. For the authorities, the need for administrative rationality and cultural homogenization reinforced each other.[28] For the clients, attainment of literacy in English meant acquiring an economic passport that permitted travel to the higher reaches of prosperity and a social passport that gave them a desired cultural identity that supplemented their legal identity.[29]

Again, recent scholarship in the history of American citizenship -- by emphasizing citizenship as membership in a polity -- reaffirms the importance of Marshall's conclusion that conflicts over citizenship are to be seen as phases in the conflict between inequality and equality, between full membership and partial membership in the nation.[30] The very distinction between member and non-member of the body politic -- as, for example, the distinction between citizen and alien -- seems to be modern in origin. Medieval law knew the conception of "allegiance," to be sure, but allegiance resided in the bonds that made individuals subjects of their kings. A medieval community was a community of allegiance, based upon the ties that bound individuals to rulers. The modern community is a community

of nationality, based upon the legal tie that unites individuals to a territory and makes them subject to its jurisdiction. Medieval law recognized distinctions between persons, obviously -- different statuses conveyed distinctively different rights -- but it did not distinguish, as modern states do, between members (citizens) and non-members (aliens). In the major statement of these principles, Calvin's Case, Sir Edward Coke defined subjectship and allegiance, and found them not to be products of positive law but of nature. The territorial state did not create the status, rights, and obligations of a community of subjects, but rather nature did. It was subjectship that created political authority, he declared, not vice versa, because allegiance obliged men to obey laws and governments. But new philosophical and political doctrines were suggesting that obedience and allegiance were not products of nature -- and therefore automatically owed to the sovereign -- but products of voluntary, individual contracts. By the end of the seventeenth century, English law implied that the act of naturalization was, in effect, a rebirth of the individual as a native-born subject, with all the rights and duties -- including that of allegiance -- of the native-born. Naturalization augmented the inner community of allegiance established originally by nature.

In the British North American colonies, economic processes supplemented and reinforced new philosophical and legal doctrines. Naturalization policies, based on the overwhelming need for immigrants, were generous, and their generosity involved in part the elimination of complex English distinctions between

natives, naturalized aliens and denizens. The status of citizen became simplified and more uniform over the colonies. Subjectship was felt increasingly to be a matter of individual contract; the privileges of membership were available to all who chose to contribute their talents to the community by immigration and by naturalization. Such liberal immigration and naturalization policies were, of course, popular with the immigrants, but they were popular with most of the native-born as well, for whom population increase was a sine qua non for cheaper labor, rising land values, and easier transfer of land titles. Immigration and citizenship policies fluctuated between the leniency that derived from new philosophic doctrines and economic pressures and the restrictiveness, especially in New England, that derived from the idea that religious and social uniformity were of crucial importance and that xenophobia was the path to that uniformity.

The American Revolution seemed to provide convincing proof of the idea that American citizenship -- a new status created by the Revolution itself -- was a matter of contract grounded on individual consent. In the post-Revolutionary period, state requirements for citizenship were essentially easy and simple -- for the native-born, support of the Revolution was enough; for immigrants, the act of immigration was, in general, enough. No state imposed language requirements for the status of citizen. Georgia went farthest in requiring attachment to "republican principles" -- an early form of "creed" or "convictions" as the basis of nationality -- and in suggesting how commitment to those principles could be demonstrated. Its act of February 7, 1785,

stipulated that persons under 16 years of age who had been sent abroad for three years to obtain an education would be treated as aliens for three years after their return to Georgia insofar as eligibility for election to the legislature and executive branches or holding any civil or military office was concerned, but would not be discriminated against in any other way. If, as Marshall argues, citizenship is a status affording full and equal membership in the collectivity, the state of Georgia was, in effect, creating a halfway status or denying that all citizens were in fact equal members of that collectivity. Georgia did not, however, imply that there was any quality that an individual possessed which was forever an impediment to his being granted citizenship; and it did imply that it had confidence that sufficient exposure to the salubrious political and social climate of Georgia would be adequate to remove the impediment. Even the more severe and restrictive naturalization acts of the post-Revolutionary period and the Alien and Sedition Laws did not impose prior tests on those seeking to acquire citizenship, but drastically extended the period of time required to demonstrate adherence to republican principles. Between alien and citizen, the status of journeyman-citizen had been created. The restrictiveness of the Alien and Sedition Laws should not blind us, however, to the fact that citizenship was still felt to derive not from birth alone, but from belief, consent and choice.

The impulse to such restrictions in the process of naturalization was a response to political and social changes. So, too, was restrictiveness in the process by which non-immigrants -- the

native-born Indians -- and some who were immigrants or non-immigrants -- like Blacks -- could qualify for citizenship. Indians, despite their being native-born, could become eligible for citizenship only by expatriating themselves from their tribes. If they retained membership in their tribes -- or "nations" -- they were ineligible for citizenship; despite their native birth, they were aliens. As to Blacks, slaves were neither alien nor citizen, but property, and therefore could be easily excluded from citizenship. "Free" Blacks were another matter; they, too, were neither aliens nor citizens, but neither were they slaves. The issue of their citizenship was not settled by law, but ultimately by warfare.

The transition from medieval to modern conceptions of citizenship and changes in the American conception of citizenship from the colonial to the early national period have considerable bearing on our understanding that language policy is both affected by and affects citizenship as a status bestowing full membership in the community:

(1) In the medieval view of allegiance, possession of a different language would have been seen as a personal quality, without any bearing on the legal and political rights of its user. In the modern period, possession of a different language is a group property, a sign of alienship which must be overcome during a period of apprenticeship.

(2) The status of American citizen created after the Revolution shows a tension between two conflicting tendencies either one of which may be paramount at a particular time. On the

one hand, acquisition of the status conveyed full membership in a republican society; it rested on individual consent, recognized no invidious distinctions, and conferred equal rights upon all members of the status. On the other hand, certain group properties were in fact recognized, as in the exclusion of Indians and Blacks. To the extent that language may be considered a group property, the requirement that English must be acquired may be seen as analogous to the requirement that the ties that bound the individual Indian to his tribe must be cut as a test of commitment, or the demand for bilingualism from the users of the non-English language may be seen as a test not of the individual's commitment to the creed that defines nationality but as a test of the government's commitment to the principle that all members of the polity are equal in their rights and obligations.

(3) Where obedience and allegiance cannot be taken for granted as products of nature, but are held to be the products of voluntary individual contracts, tests may be applied to determine whether allegiance and obedience are present in the required degree. These tests will vary in kind and intensity at times when obedience and allegiance are felt to be eroding or when the authorities lose confidence in their ability to command them.

(4) The idea that the act of naturalization was in effect a rebirth of the alien as a native-born subject, augmenting by positive law the inner community of allegiance ordained by

nature, suggests that language policy is seen as helping to establish an inner community of allegiance, not to a certain prince but to certain principles; separateness of language is seen as a continuation of alienship from that inner community.

(5) Even when adherence to a non-English language is not a technical disqualification for the status of citizen, adherence to it may be stigmatized as indicating less than full acceptance of the creed that determines nationality and as prolonging the probationary or apprenticeship status that precedes the granting of full citizenship.

The history of language policy clearly shows it to be an aspect of the history of citizenship; a conflict in the former is often evidence of a crisis in the latter. In the history of the United States, at least until quite recently, these conflicts have come about largely as a result of pressures brought by government on non-English speakers, because adherence to the non-English language has been taken as lack of loyalty to the inner community of allegiance. But recent conflicts over language policy, including the demand for bilingualism, may arise to a considerable degree from demands from the non-English speakers. Does this mean that the inner community to which they give their allegiance is not the same as that of the majority? Does it mean that they reject the use of language as the test of allegiance to that community? Timothy Smith has argued that non-English-speaking immigrants both learned English and maintained their native language: they "were able to accept the divergence of the

two ideologies of pluralism and nationalism and to cultivate both of them, precisely because their political loyalties embraced two worlds. Their American platform was pluralism, even when they championed separatism at home [in Europe]....The cultivation of the sense of nationality through church and fraternal educational programs in America thus fulfilled two divergent purposes, though the immigrants themselves did not find them contradictory."[31] Present-day advocates of bilingualism do not see in it a way of identifying themselves with the thwarted national aspirations of the suppressed peoples of the Czarist Empire or the Austro-Hungarian Empire, say, but a way of asserting their claim to equality of treatment as full members of the collectivity. If that is so, then the demand for bilingualism marks another stage in the political migration from subjectship to citizenship and in the way in which language policy is used in political controversy -- by whom and to achieve what ends. Bilingualism surely has its dangers, but perhaps language now, like the parochial religions and education which to earlier generations provided the "nursery of two patriotisms,"[32] it may be a means by which new groups become convinced that they are being treated as equal members of the inner community of allegiance.

That disputes over language policy and education are politics by other means -- and therefore reveal or conceal the existence of even broader social conflicts -- is a conclusion warranted not only by American history but by history in general. If this is a conclusion that seems to emphasize the difficulty of the language problem by showing it in the matrix in which it is

embedded, it has the merit of showing that there can be no solution unless it is seen in that matrix.

V

More than fifty years ago Professor Charles Merriam of the University of Chicago organized an inquiry into the making of citizens in a number of countries throughout the world. In the final summary volume of the series, Merriam wrote:

> The role of language and literature in shaping group cohesiveness and loyalty has long been recognized. It is more effective in molding the political group than any other with the exception of the cultural group termed the "nationality" of the nation. It carries a double appeal, to the understanding and to the emotions as well. A common language is a medium for the interchange of ideas in their many finer nuances, and makes possible a discussion of common interests and policies. At the same time the familiar sound of one's own language contrasted with the barbarity of all other tongues constitutes a bond of union....
>
> One of the first symbols of the emancipation of a group is the restoration of its language to a position of priority. Linguistic differences are to be found in the United States, but they are the survivals of immigrant groups, and the language scarcely endures to the second generation. There is perhaps no country in the world so nearly unilingual as the United States....
>
> The presence of a common language is still one of the most common agencies in the growth of a cultural community, and likewise, community of language is a factor of inestimable value to political unity....Of course, a system of education in bilingual form might reduce the distinctive and isolating nature of any single tongue....In the older states, such as Britain and France, it is clear that linguistic differences are on the wane, as they are slowly elided in the great process of assimilation, which goes steadily forward. In newer states, the lingustic factor tends

> to exert a far more powerful influence than in the older, and often becomes a chief rallying point for national culture.

Addressing himself directly to the relation between education, language and political unity, Merriam concluded:

> ...an examination of the various techniques employed in civic training indicates that fundamental and far-reaching changes are likely to be made in the future by such experimenters as are concerned with the process of producing citizens....The newer technique of civic education are the use of the press, the political parties, the special patriotic organizations, and, far more important, the employment of the formal school system of the political community for the development of the political community. On the whole, the school emerges as the dominant figure in the new process of civic education, and in all probability, will continue to hold this position for some time to come, and to strengthen its influence with the adoption of more scientific methods of analysis and instruction. Here will center the struggle, scientific and political, for the control of social and political behavior, at one time or another, centering around the family, the army, the church. The state-builder of the future will address himself to this strategic point in the organization of political interest, allegiance and ideals. To be sure, the school cannot be effective unless it is integrated with the life of the community, and supported by social morale and a sense of political and social values outside the educational institution. But assuming that the school and society are not too far apart in their codes of behavior, the educational organization under such circumstances will wield enormous power over the oncoming generation in the formation of interests, drives, attitudes and skills....[33]

The accuracy of Merriam's historical analysis and prediction of the future is not important here. What is important is his placing of the discussion of bilingualism -- as cultural phenomenon and as educational policy -- squarely in the context of the development of ideas about political unity and citizenship. We can see once again that a controversy over

bilingualism betokens an even deeper, perhaps hidden, struggle over the definition of Americanness, over how loyalty to Americanness is to be demonstrated, and over the meaning of citizenship; it suggests that political values that may long have been taken for granted have now become problematic.

Clearly, for Merriam and for those who looked at the problem as he did, language policy and the schools in general were important primarily as agencies affecting the cohesiveness of the state, which was a value taken for granted. To require literacy in English for citizenship was not unreasonable, since it contributed to national cohesiveness, a value almost universally accepted. Besides, citizenship was seen primarily as an individual property, not as a group property, one which provided an individual with a passport to political rights and not the

But what happens when the cohesiveness of the state ceases to be a value for a significant segment of the society, or becomes a value of less importance than some others? And what happens if, as a result of changing conceptions concerning the relationship between an individual and the ethnic group to which he belongs, "making it" as an individual must now compete with "making it" as a group? In both cases, to exert a claim <u>against</u> the state, or to use the state to assert a claim against some other group within the state, becomes at least as important as, if not more important than, the unity of the state.

Mary Antin's autobiography shows that her understanding of history led her to one conclusion about the relationship between

her government and herself, or the group to which she belonged: "As I read how the patriots planned the Revolution...it dawned on me gradually what was meant by my country. The people all doing noble things, and striving for them together, defying their oppressors, giving their lives for each other -- all that it was that made my country." But what if one's understanding of history and definition of the present lead to a different conclusion about the relationship between the government and oneself, or the group to which one belongs? Suppose one sees government itself as the oppressor, and its insistence upon the use of English as a mark of that oppression? To such people, bilingualism would not be seen (as Merriam would have seen it) as a policy detrimental to the unity of the state and therefore to be looked at with suspicion. For them, it might well become one of the demands made <u>against</u> the state itself or a demand for a mechanism by which one group which feels itself to be discriminated against attempts to use the state to exert a claim against other groups which it feels to be more privileged. A controversy over bilingualism is more than a technical debate over methods of education; that it is an issue on the agenda at all and the form in which it is presented as an issue (in what language or languages should elementary education be conducted; should literacy tests for voting or for citizenship be given in one language, or more; should official government proclamations be issued in one language or more; etc.) testify to the fact that values once taken for granted are now being questioned.[34]

VI

This account of the relation between language and even broader social issues -- like the political unity of the state and the meaning of citizenship and loyalty, and bilingualism as a prescription that implies a cure for some social pathology or as itself a symptom of pathology -- emphasizes controversy. What does a language controversy signify? There may be controversy over the diagnosis. And even where there is agreement as to the diagnosis, there may be controversy over the therapy. Is bilingualism the cure, or would it worsen the disease? Even the sketchiest of historical accounts, by pointing to the areas in which controversies over language have erupted, and to the different forms in which those controversies have been conducted, suggests that conflicts over demands for changes in language policy express deep-seated changes in American society.

Though the historian Marc Bloch pointed out years ago that medieval England was "hierarchically bilingual," that is, two languages were spoken: the upper-class spoke French, the lower-class spoke Anglo-Saxon (a third language, Latin, was the language of the church and of much official written business), the implications of the coexistence of different languages for American history has not been much studied before the very recent period. What we do know, however, permits us to say that the degree to which contact between languages becomes a matter of conflict depends not only on changes in the <u>general</u> social and political context, but on the realms or domains within which the

languages come into contact. One early attempt to define the domains of language contact identified family, playground and street, school, church, literature, the press, the military, the judicial system, and government administration. Surely, contact in each of these domains does not produce equal amounts of conflict; in some, it may produce none at all. The timing, intensity, and form of conflict tell us much about the changing position of non-English-speaking groups in the United States and the demands made of them and by them. Within the domain of the family, for example, language conflict has tended to be written about as a conflict of generations and to have been experienced more as a personal, psychological problem than as a social conflict. But among some groups and perhaps more often now than in the remote past, personal humiliation as a result of language differences is interpreted as a group phenomenon which can be eliminated by treating the two languages equally. Language conflict in the domain of education has mobilized certain constituencies; in the domain of government administration, others. Each of the domains in which language conflict has arisen has brought people together for a limited set of purposes -- that is, it has activized certain of their statuses -- and has suggested an appropriate set of tactics. In the past, language conflict arising from the feeling that the users of one language were inferior to those of another, was not always correlated with a sense of inferior-superior in <u>all</u> of the domains in which the users of those languages met, and the conflict, therefore, tended to be limited and expressed in the form appropriate to the domain

in which it arose. But the possibility exists, perhaps more now than before, that the users of the non-English language feel either that the treatment of their language expresses the inferiority in which they are held in general -- they are not full members or citizens of the polity -- or demand equal treatment for their language in certain domains -- education, government administration, and broadcasting, for example -- as a test of their acceptance to full citizenship. Under these circumstances, the possibility that the conflict will become sharper and assume new, less limited, forms will increase.

Conclusions derived from the historical record, even if true, are not applicable to the past alone. Even in matters concerning language, the past, like a genetic code that provides information to a new organism, lives into the present. Beginning when England was "hierarchically bilingual" and extending at least into the nineteenth century, a body of ideas circulated among the lower classes that came to be called the Norman Yoke. Expressed for the most part orally (but, whether orally or written, in English), the Norman Yoke held that the English had lived once in peace and freedom and plenty, but had been conquered by the Normans, who exploited them in their demands for labor services and imposed their customs and laws -- and their language. Some day in the future the English would expel the conquerors, restore their ancient privileges and liberties, and win back the right to use their own language. The Norman Yoke

was, therefore, at once a prescription -- a call for political action -- and a diagnosis -- an analysis of the pathology that made such action necessary. It circulated in one of the two languages which coexisted at the time, though on quite an unequal basis, and it survived as a result of the will of its adherents, as that will was affected by their understanding of past history and present politics.

A demand about language, for example, that it be accorded equal treatment in education, expressed as a dream or a wish in a language held in contempt, like the ideas of the Norman Yoke, may express a response of brooding resentment on the part of a group that feels that both history and present policy deprive them of full membership in society. Where official acceptance or rejection of bilingualism, in the schools and elsewhere, has depended on whether the group involved has been considered socially and politically acceptable, and where the decision to impose English as the sole language has reflected wider attitudes toward that group, including the degree of hostility felt toward it, it would not be surprising if, among the Spanish-speaking people in the United States, there were to be found an equivalent of the Norman Yoke, a version of history and a vision of the future expressed in a language whose use has come to symbolize a desire for the full membership that is supposed to be the honor and privilege of equal citizenship. Migrants travel from country to country and move from alienship to citizenship. Those who seek to improve the status of the group to which they belong also wish to move from alienship to citizenship. When legal

citizenship is granted, but equal membership is denied, they may still feel alienated, but they are aliens in their own country, not in a foreign land.

Footnotes

1 Allen Walker Read, "American Projects for an Academy to Regulate Speech," Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, LI, 1152-53, 1153-59.

2 Charles Issawi, "The Struggle for Linguistic Hegemony, 1780-1880," The American Scholar, L (1981), 385.

3 Quoted in Issawi, 383.

4 Flora Lewis, "Speaking in Tongues," New York Times, Feb. 4, 1982.

5 James H. S. Bossard, "The Bilingual as a Person -- Linguistic Identification with Status," American Sociological Review, X (1945), 699-709.

6 Lewis, New York Times, Feb. 4, 1982.

7 The discussion which follows about language policies and German-Americans, Mexican-Americans, and Puerto Ricans is a summary of the work of Arnold H. Leibowitz, Educational Policy and Political Acceptance: The Imposition of English as the Language of Instruction in American Schools (ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Washington, 1971), 6-24, 44-62, 81-104.

8 Quoted in David T. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, 1974), 107.

9 Ibid., 6-24.

10 Arthur Mann, The One and the Many: Reflections on the American Identity (Chicago and London, 1979), 127-31.

11 Quoted in H. Manuel, The Education of Mexican and Spanish-Speaking Children in Texas (1930), 76-77.

12 **Leibowitz, op cit., 44-62**

13 International Institute, Columbia University Teachers College, A Survey of the Public Educatonal System of Porto Rico (New York, 1926), 205.

14 Quoted in J. Osuna, A History of Education in Puerto Rico (1949), 60.

15 Quoted in P. Cebollero, A School Language Policy for Puerto Rico (1945), 6-7.

16 Quoted in Osuna, 363.

17 Quoted in Osuna, 374-75.

18 The Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1939 volume, The Constitution Prevails (Washington, 1941), 160.

19 Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States, Harry S. Truman. 1946 Volume (Washington, 1962), 466.

20 Leibowitz, op. cit., 81-104.

21 The persistent use of attitudes toward language to mask other attitudes toward the group using that language may be seen in a December 12, 1982, article in the New York Times, in which it was reported from Houston, Texas, that a United States citizen who attended Texas schools but had to use an interpreter in court had been ordered by a judge to take an English course:

> David Sanchez, 19 years old, explained through his bilingual attorney that he had gone to public schools in Brownsville but he was unable to converse in English. He speaks Spanish. He pleaded guilty to attempted burglary.

He was sentenced to three years' probation and a $500 fine and ordered to attend night courses in English as a condition of probation. The judge said he would be in violation of the probation terms "if he had not learned to speak some English in six months." One wonders whether Spanish-speakers in Texas feel that Mr. Sanchez was guilty of attempted burglary or of speaking Spanish.

22 See, among others, Mann, op. cit., 49, 55, 68, 178.

23 Harding, 31, 102-03

24 Quoted in Edward H. Reisner, Nationalism and Education since 1789 (New York, 1929), 194.

25 Ibid., 560.

26 T.H. Marshall, Class, Citizenship, and Social Development (New York, 1965), 92, 101ff.

27 Quoted in Sigmund Diamond, "Immigration, Citizenship, and Social Change: Intention and Outcome in American History," in Robert K. Merton, James S. Coleman, and Peter H. Rossi, eds., Qualitative and Quantitative Social Research: Papers in Honor of Paul F. Lazarsfeld (New York and London, 1979), 276-77.

28 See, for example, Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy and Schools (New York, 1975) and Tyack, One Best System.

29 Timothy L. Smith, "Immigrant Social Aspirations and American Education, 1880-1930," in Michael B. Katz, ed., Education in American History (New York, 1973), 336-59.

30 Much of the material on which the following discussion of changes in conception of citizenship is based can be found in James H. Kettner, The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870 (Chapel Hill, 1978), 4, 5, 28, 42-43, 106-08, 208-09, 213-46, 319-33.

31 Smith, 249.

32 Smith, 250.

33 Charles Edward Merriam, The Making of Citizens (Chicago, 1931).

34 Recognition of the fact that bilingualism in education expresses a conflict over citizenship and loyalty has led such a stalwart critic as Nathan Glazer to moderate his views in recent months: "The argument that has the most weight in turning people skeptical about bilingual-bicultural education is not the educational achievement argument, or the cultural respect argument....It is the unity-divisiveness argument....I have tried to ask myself why I believe this, and I give some pragmatic reasons.... The pragmatic arguments for a common language and culture and an educational system that imposes it do not stand up very well. One cannot avoid issues of value, which are hard to justify pragmatically....The demand for bilingual-bicultural education is not purely linguistic or pragmatic. It is a demand not only for educational achievement and jobs; it is also a demand made out of an alternate loyalty, loyalty to a culture and language that must inevitably be linked to foreign countries. I have suggested that my views are somewhat more uncertain than they were...." Nathan Glazer, "Pluralism and the New Immigrants," Society, XIX (1981), 34-35. A number of other articles in the same issue of Society show a similar moderation of their authors' onetime extreme opposition to bilingualism.